APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,968	09/09/2003	Youngja Park	YOR920030241US1 (16751)	3125

23389 7590 04/05/2007	EXAMINER
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC	
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA	JONES, DANELLE E
SUITE 300	
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/658,968	PARK, YOUNGJA
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Danelle E. Jones	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 September 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 September 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/9/2003</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1.   Claims 1-11, 13-15, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goldsmith US 6,405,161.

Regarding **claim 1,** Goldsmith discloses a computer system for analyzing text in one or more electronic documents (see col. 3 lines 66-67 – col. 4, lines 1-4), comprising:

one or more system interfaces (see fig. 2, element 202 and 208 and col. 6, lines 34 – 40);

and an affix process that determines one or more affixes of one or more words in one or more of the documents and provides the affixes to the system interface (see fig. 1 step 104 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

Regarding **claim 2,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 1, further disclosing where one or more of the affixes are nested affixes, each nested affix comprising one or more affixes (see col. 6, lines 1-5 where "ingly" is an extracted nested affix).

Regarding **claim 3,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 1, further disclosing where the affix process determines one or more suffixes of one or more of the words (see fig. 1, step 104 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

Regarding **claim 4,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 3, further disclosing where

one or more of the suffixes are nested suffixes, each nested suffix comprising one or

more suffixes (see col. 6, lines 1-5 where "ingly" is an extracted nested suffix).

Regarding **claim 5,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 1 as discussed above,

Goldsmith does not disclose where the affix process determines one or more infixes of

one or more of the words (see col. 1, lines 19-22 and see fig. 1 step 104 and col. 5,

lines 22-24, although infix is not specifically stated it is well known in the art that an infix

is a type of affix).

Regarding **claim 6,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 5, further disclosing, where

one or more of the infixes are nested infixes, each nested infix comprising one or more

infixes (see col. 1, lines 19-22 and see col. 6, lines 1-5 where "ingly" is an extracted

nested affix, although infix is not specifically stated it is well known in the art that an infix

is a type of affix).

Regarding **claim 7,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 1, further disclosing

wherein the affix process determines one or more prefixes of one or more of the words

(see fig. 1 step 108 and col. 6, lines 9-10).

Regarding **claim 8,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 7, further disclosing

wherein one or more of the prefixes are nested prefixes, each nested prefix comprising

one or more prefix (see col. 13, lines 6-7).

Regarding **claim 9,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 1, further disclosing where

the interface compiles a list of affixes that are in one or more of the documents (see col.

5, lines 62-66).

Regarding **claim 10,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 1, further disclosing

where the affixes are not listed in a dictionary that is accessible to the system (see col.

5, lines 37-38, where the affix is determined by determining the optimal division, not by

referring to a dictionary)

Regarding **claim 11,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 1, further disclosing

where the system interface is any one or more of the following: a graphical user

interface, a print out, an interface to a text analysis system (see fig. 2, lines elements

202 and 208 and see col. 6, lines 31-40).

Regarding **claim 13, 21** Goldsmith discloses a method for analyzing text in one or more

electronic documents (see col. 3 lines 66-67 – col. 4, lines 1-4), comprising the steps:

using a computer system to perform an affix process that determines one or more

affixes of one or more words in one or more of the electronic documents (see fig. 2 and

col. 6, lines 31-33, where the method of fig. 1, describes the affix determination

process);

and providing the determined one or more of the affixes to an interface of the computer

system for display to a user (see fig. 2, element 208 and col. 6, lines 39-40).

Regarding **claim 14, 22** Goldsmith discloses the method of claim 13, further disclosing

wherein at least one of the affixes is a nested affix including a plurality of affixes (see

col. 6, lines 1-5 where "ingly" is an extracted nested affix).

Regarding **claim 15, 23** Goldsmith discloses the method of claim 13, further disclosing,

the step of, said interface compiling a list of the determined one or more affixes (see col.

5, lines 62-66).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   Claims 12, 16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Goldsmith US 6,405,161 in view of Wang et al US 6,904,402.

Regarding **claim 12,** Goldsmith discloses the system in claim 1 as described above.

Goldsmith does not disclose where the affix process uses a Patricia tree to show

substrings of words (see col. 1, lines 50-59). However this feature is well known in the

art as evidenced by Wang et al. Wang et al. discloses a system and iterative method

for segmentation uses a Patricia tree. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a Patricia tree to enable a higher-level application to quickly traverse a language model and provide real-time characteristics (see col. 1, lines 42-45).

Regarding **claim 16, 24** Goldsmith discloses the method of claim 13 as discussed above. Goldsmith does not the using step including the step of using a Patricia tree to show substrings of words. However this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Wang et al. Wang et al. discloses a system and iterative method for segmentation uses a Patricia tree. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a Patricia tree to show substrings of words enable a higher-level application to quickly traverse a language model and provide real-time characteristics (see col. 1, lines 42-45).

2.   Claims 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldsmith US 6,405,161 in view of Kanno US 7,103,536.

Regarding **claim 17, 25** Goldsmith discloses the method of claim 13 as discussed above. Goldsmith does not disclose the using step including the steps of, for each of a set of said words, adding the words into a prefix Patricia tree; reversing the word; and adding the reversed word into a suffix Patricia tree. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Kanno. Kanno discloses reversing a word and adding it to a

Patricia tree for suffix matching (see col. 1, lines 44-47). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to reverse a word and add it to the

Patricia tree for suffix matching.

3.   Claims 18-20 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Goldsmith US 6,405,161 in view of Kanno US 7,103,536 as applied

to claims 17 and 25 above, and further in view of Wang et al. US 6,904,402.

Regarding **claim 18, 26** the method of claims 17 and 25 have been met as discussed

above. Goldsmith further discloses generating potential affixes (see col. 5, lines 23-25).

Goldsmith does not disclose wherein the using step includes the further step of, for the

words in said set of words, using the Patricia trees to generate all potential affixes in

said set of words. However this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Wang

et al. Wang et al. discloses a system and iterative method for segmentation uses a

Patricia tree. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to use a Patricia tree to generate all potential affixes in said set of words to

enable a higher-level application to quickly traverse a language model and provide real-

time characteristics (see col. 1, lines 42-45).

Regarding **claim 19, 27** the limitations of claims 18 and 26 have been met as discussed

above. Goldsmith further discloses wherein the using step includes the further step of

counting stems, which meet defined criteria, for the affixes for the words in said set of

words (see col. 6, lines 66 –col. 7, line 7).

Regarding **claim 20, 28** the limitations of claims 18 and 27 have been met as discussed

above. Goldsmith further discloses wherein the using step includes the further step of

disambiguating at least some of the potential affixes to identify nested affixes (see col.

lines 1-5).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Danelle E. Jones whose telephone number is 571-270-

1241. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DJ

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER